

REMARKS

Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1 and 3-46 are pending in the present application. Claims 14-44 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 45, and 46 are the independent claims. Claims 1, 45, and 46 have been amended. No new matter is believed to have been added.

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 13, 45, and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 8-211317 (Hori) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,118,238 (Munro et al.). Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hori in view of Munro et al., and further in view of KR 2002-0033922 (Choi et al.). Claims 8-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hori in view of Munro et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,430,362 (Carr et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1, 45, and 46 now recite, inter alia, wherein the motor drive chip is mounted on a main printed circuit board of a printing machine with which the laser scanning unit is used, the main printed circuit board being disposed remotely from the laser scanning unit.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the asserted citations teaches or suggests at least the aforementioned features of independent claims 1, 45, and 46. Thus, without conceding the propriety of the asserted combinations, the asserted combinations are likewise deficient.

The Office Action contends that the IC of Hori is a motor drive chip. (Office Action, page 3). The Office Action also contends that the motor drive chip, mounted on circuit board 17 of Hori, is mounted on a main circuit board of a printing machine. (Office Action, page 4). This latter contention is respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit, however, that even assuming arguendo that the Office's characterization is correct, Hori does not disclose the aforementioned features of independent claims 1, 45, and 46.

A review of FIG. 1, for example, shows that the board 17 is mounted on the casing 11, which is alleged to be a housing. Also, this mounting of the board has been repeatedly confirmed by the Office in the prosecution of this application. Still further, Hori teaches that the mounting of the circuit board 17 to the casing 11 is necessary to prevent adverse influence of temperature on parts in the casing. (Hori, Abstract, "Purpose"). Thus, Hori teaches away from

the aforementioned features of independent claims 1, 45, and 46.

Additionally, the IC of the board 17 of Hori is expressly taught to control the semiconductor laser source 16 and the motor 13. (Hori, paragraph [0012]). Thus, it is submitted that the board 17 is more like an LSU controlling circuit (see, e.g., Hori, FIG. 5) than a main printed circuit board.

The secondary citation to Munro et al. relates to a motor starting apparatus for an engine driven generator and is cited for various features of various dependent claims. Applicants respectfully submit that Munro et al. adds nothing that would remedy the aforementioned deficiency of Hori.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-7, 13, 45, and 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of claims 4 and 8-12 under § 103, Choi et al. and Carr et al. respectively relate to a method of fabricating a display package using in a head mounting visual display and an engine starting system utilizing multiple controlled acceleration rates. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Choi et al. nor Carr et al. add anything that remedies the aforementioned deficiency in the combination of Hori and Munro et al.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims patentably define the present invention over the citations of record. Further, the dependent claims should also be allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims and further due to the additional features that they recite. Separate and individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants believe that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action. However, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to such matters.


There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 6-5-07

By: 
Michael E. Kondoudis
Registration No. 42,758

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501